

REMARKS

In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, reconsideration and further examination are requested.

By this amendment, claims 1, 2, and 10-12 have been canceled in favor of new claims 13-15. Also, claims 3-9 have been amended. Therefore, claims 3-9 and 13-15 are pending.

Claim 13 has been drafted to include all the limitations of claims 1 and 2, as well as the additional recitation that the character string input area is composed of a single frame in which one or more handwritten characters are recognized. Claims 14 and 15 have been drafted in a corresponding manner.

Claims 1, 2, 4, and 6-12 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kawamura in view of Chisaka. This rejection is traversed and is believed to be inapplicable to claims 13-15 and 3-9 for the following reasons.

As discussed above, claims 13-15 recite that the character string input area is composed of a single frame in which one or more handwritten characters are recognized. Accordingly, as recited in claims 13-15, the judgment as to whether an input of an immediately preceding handwritten character string is complete is made based on a first coordinate of one of the strokes being detected in a first area which is at a side of the character string input area where writing of the handwritten character string starts. Claims 13-15 further recite that when the input is judged to be complete, stroke strings for each character from all the strokes of the immediately preceding handwritten character string are segmented, and the characters are recognized.

Thus, as illustrated by the limitations discussed above, claims 13-15 recite handwritten character recognition wherein a plurality of handwritten characters are recognized from within an input area that is composed of a single frame. This is not the case with any of the prior art of record.

The Examiner contends that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Kawamura's two frame input area into a "less advanced" single frame input area. The Examiner contends that Chisaka discloses a character string input area composed of a single frame. See Office Action, page 4, lines 1-8. However, as set forth in detail below, Chisaka does not

disclose an input area composed of a single frame. Moreover, a single frame input area is not necessarily less advanced as contended by the Examiner.

As discussed above, claims 13-15 include specific recitations regarding judgment of whether an input of an immediately preceding handwritten character string is complete, segmentation of stroke strings based on the judgment, and recognition of each character, which effect the character recognition of a plurality of handwritten characters from an input area in composed of a single frame. Thus, it is not proper to assume that a single frame input character recognition is "less advanced" than a plural-frame character recognition.

The Examiner contends that Chisaka discloses the character string input area being composed of a single frame (Figs. 5A - 5E). However, this contention by the Examiner is completely incorrect, which can be easily determined by referring to the discussion of Figs. 5A-5E in column 14, lines 26-49 of Chisaka. Insofar as it relates to the presently claimed invention wherein a plurality of handwritten characters can be recognized within a single "frame", the term "cell" in column 14 can be considered to correspond to the claimed "single frame". This is so because once a detection of handwritten input is made, a cell is displayed in the system of Chisaka into which a character is inputted. Once the character is finished, successive "cells" or frames 22A are displayed into which each handwritten character is written. This type of multiple frame input method is conventional. In contrast, the character recognition recited in claims 13-15 has a single frame character string input area in which a plurality of handwritten characters can be recognized. Thus, Chisaka does not disclose or suggest the judgment of whether an input of an immediately preceding handwritten character string is completed when a first coordinate of one of the strokes is detected in a first area which is at a side of the character string input area where writing of the handwritten character string starts as recited in claims 13-15.

Moreover, as acknowledged by the Examiner, the primary reference does not disclose the character string input area being composed of a single frame. Therefore, neither of these applied references discloses a system capable of recognizing a plurality of handwritten characters in a single frame input area. Accordingly, the inventions recited in claims 13-15 do not result from any obvious

combination of Kawamura and Chisaka. Thus, claims 13-15, and dependent claims 3-9 are allowable over the prior art of record.

In view of the above, it is submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone to resolve any remaining issues.

Respectfully submitted,

Ichiro NAKAO et al.

By: 

Jeffrey R. Filipek

Registration No. 41,471

Attorney for Applicants

JRF/fs

Washington, D.C. 20006-1021

Telephone (202) 721-8200

Facsimile (202) 721-8250

January 13, 2005